

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~March 6th, 1959COCOM Document No. 3416.00/3COORDINATING COMMITTEE

J. General

RECORD OF DISCUSSIONONTHE REVISION OF THE STRATEGIC EXPORT CONTROLS:OUTSTANDING MATTERS CONCERNINGCATEGORY 601-699 - METALS, MINERALS AND THEIR MANUFACTURESITEMS 1635, 1648, 1661(b) and (c).February 26th, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM 3016.00/4; 3016.35/1 and 2; 3016.61/1 and 2; 3416.00/1 and 2; 3416.35/1; 3416.48/1 and 2; 3416.61/1; COCOM Sub-C (58)6 and 8; Metals and Alloys Working Paper 29.

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that some Delegation had requested the postponement until March 12th of the discussion, which was on the present agenda, concerning the outstanding items in the Metals Category. He warned the Committee once more of the urgent need for getting an agreement on these items, especially on cobalt compounds.

2. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that he could accept the postponement of the discussion until March 12th.

3. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that the present discussions on metals were still in the context of the 1958 List Review since the Consultative Group had laid on COCOM the task of continuing discussions on metals. Anxious as were the United Kingdom Delegation and all others to come to decisions, the Committee should not lose sight of the bases on which the whole Review had been carried out. The decisions would have to be in line with the criteria and any solutions based on deals on inconsistent assessments as between different items would not be acceptable to the United Kingdom authorities. Nevertheless, it was possible, without doing violence to the Committee's duty to get the right answers by adherence to the criteria, to make some compromise moves to bring adjustment between conflicting viewpoints.

4. The Delegate continued that there were two really important items - 1648 and 1661(b) which had not been sufficiently explored at the technical level and where he felt that both sides might show a greater degree of adaptability. There was a basic difference of view between the United Kingdom and United States Delegations over Item 1661. The United Kingdom held that this item contained much which was of no significance, while the United States view was the opposite. In the United Kingdom view there was ample work still to be done in this field by experts and it was essential to have a United States expert present at the discussions. The position on Item 1648 was

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3416.00/3

different since cobalt alloys were not on List I but the United Kingdom were prepared to accept some form of control and had made some proposals to this effect. For these reasons the United Kingdom authorities felt that it was essential for there to be adequate technical discussion when the matter was next taken up on March 12th.

5. The FRENCH Delegate said that he agreed with his United Kingdom colleague about the urgent need to reach a decision on these outstanding items but he did not share the same conclusions. He considered that the technical discussions which had already taken place in the Committee had enabled Member Governments to form an opinion on the technical questions. In his opinion, the decision to be taken was at the political level. If further technical discussions were to take place, the French Delegation would participate with the assistance of experts. The Delegate stressed that his authorities were ready to take all necessary steps to facilitate a compromise, for they did not wish the situation to remain as vague and unsatisfactory as it was at the present moment.

6. The GERMAN Delegate shared in principle the opinion expressed by the French Delegate, but added that he would recommend to his authorities that they should send an expert for the discussions on March 12th if some Delegations thought another meeting of experts was necessary, although it was doubtful whether the German expert would be able to come again.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that his own impression was that it would be a backward step to start all over again the general technical discussion on alloys. He recalled that the Consultative Group in July 1958 had given the Committee a number of questions to settle. Item 1648 was awaiting a decision by the Belgian and United States Governments on compounds, otherwise there seemed to be agreement. As for Item 1661, he agreed that the Committee had been left with no decision to change the definition, apart from the exclusion of resistance wires (COCOM 3416.61/1, paragraph 4).

8. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that he subscribed to much of the Chairman's analysis of the difficult situation facing the Committee. The United Kingdom Delegate had mentioned the need for give and take; the United States had given and not taken in the discussions on these three outstanding items. He noted with gratification that cobalt alloys were covered by the latest United Kingdom control order to a greater extent than under the German-United States proposal. The suggestion of striking some sort of bargain had been made before, but his authorities had not agreed to it. As far as cobalt alloys were concerned, the United States had, through a succession of compromises, reached a "last resort" position. The Delegate had thought that the German-United States proposal on cobalt alloys should satisfy reasonable United Kingdom desires, and that final agreement on cobalt alloys awaited only final agreement on cobalt compounds, on which there had been virtual agreement at one point. He had not thought it was dependent on further review of Item 1661(b), where the United States had agreed to exclude resistance wire, and on which the agreed record showed discussion closed until Autumn. Furthermore, the Committee was aware that a satisfactory resolution of Item 1648 would enable the question of the coverage of Item 1635 to be resolved.

9. The FRENCH Delegate pointed out that the position concerning cobalt alloys had not been finally decided because of the lack of agreement on compounds. The Belgian Delegate had pointed out that it was as easy to extract cobalt from alloys as it was from compounds thus, logically, the majority of the Committee had followed this opinion.

10. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that he was sorry the Chairman had not a more optimistic view of the present situation. He still maintained that there were important points which could usefully be discussed by experts and he had, in any case, to reserve his position on the new proposal concerning Item 1661(b).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

COCOM Document No. 3416.00/3

11. The CANADIAN Delegate said that he agreed with the United Kingdom Delegate that a further technical meeting could usefully be convened.

12. The UNITED STATES Delegate noted that only the United Kingdom, which seemed to be the only Delegation objecting to the coming into force of the revised Item 1661(b) and to the German-United States proposal on cobalt alloys and the Canadian Delegation which was the only Delegation opposing the addition of nickel-based alloy scrap to Item 1661, had raised the question of United States experts. He undertook to report back to his authorities but said that he did not know whether or not an expert would be present on March 12th. Any number of technical facts had been exchanged in the course of these discussions, and the United States had contributed many of them, covering all matters pertaining to its positions, as well as commenting fully on the technical and other aspects of the United Kingdom and others' positions. The United Kingdom Delegate had not recently been accompanied by experts, or presented any new material, and the United Kingdom position on cobalt and nickel alloys seemed less clear now than it had seemed some time ago. The Delegate also noted that the United States had answered the Canadian questions on nickel alloy scrap, and had in turn put a question to his Canadian colleague. He hoped that the Canadian Delegate would soon be able to answer his question on nickel based alloy scrap and he invited the United Kingdom Delegate to state on what specific points he considered that experts were still required, or at least to clarify the specific United Kingdom positions, so that the need for experts could be studied carefully. He invited the Canadian Delegate to do the same.

13. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate replied that there was still room for expert discussion on Item 1661(b). Despite the decision to postpone consideration of this item until autumn, experts could still outline their proposals on this item.

14. After the BELGIAN, ITALIAN and NETHERLANDS Delegates had indicated that they would not be assisted by experts on March 12th, the CHAIRMAN summed up the discussion by saying that as far as cobalt was concerned he hoped for an agreement at the appropriate level since only the Belgian and United States Delegations were outstanding on the point of compounds and, as for alloys, the only final agreement awaited was that of the United Kingdom Delegation. The discussion on Item 1661(b) had been postponed but it would still be in order to raise objections to the definition scheduled to come into force on March 15th. With regard to Item 1661(c), the Committee were only awaiting the reply of the Canadian Delegation.

CONFIDENTIAL